

14 August 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel

FROM : James Taylor  
Chairman, Executive Career Service Board

SUBJECT : Comments on the Personnel Evaluation  
Task Force Report

1. (U) In general the members of the Executive Career Service Board are in agreement with the conclusions of the Task Force and its recommendations. They should be commended for a thorough analytical effort.

2. (U) There are, however, a few areas of disagreement with Task Force proposals:

- a. (U) The adoption of a "7-point" scale to evaluate performance of duties or an employee's overall value will not improve very much the ability to objectively record an employee's true contribution to the work of the Agency. It may well make it even more obscure. The consensus seems to be that the more levels the more likely the tendency toward inflated evaluations. A "4-point" scale with sharp, easily defined differences between points would probably be most informative to the ratee and to management, and would be more easily managed; e.g.

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY

1. Superior performance
  2. Proficient performance
  3. Remediable performance
  4. Unsatisfactory performance
- b. (U) There is substantial non-concurrence with the idea of an "interim" written rating of any kind. Perhaps a similar objective could be achieved by requesting employees to indicate whether deficiencies had been discussed with him or her prior to the completion of the performance appraisal report.
- c. (U) Both the Career Service and the Inspector General firmly believe that an employee should be apprised of all rankings, ratings, documents, etc. which are used to determine placement on promotion ranking lists and on personnel assignment selection lists. Panels should be proscribed from using verbally transmitted opinions from whatever source.
- d. (U) The Career Service believes that the more that can be provided for through the format (form) of the report and the less through reliance on tangential written instructions, the more likelihood that informative reports will be prepared. We agree that a narrative should accompany the rating of each duty as well as an overall narrative summary.
- e. (U) The ability of a rater to evaluate and to express those evaluations in a clear, objective, and analytical fashion has, of course, a serious affect on an understanding of the ratee's evaluations. Whether the recording of either a ratee or reviewer's opinion of the rater's ability to rate and to express his ratings on a ratee's performance evaluation form contributes much to an understanding of a ratee's performance is questionable. A supervisor who has demonstrated that he cannot prepare a constructive rational evaluation of a subordinate's performance should be prohibited from evaluating anyone. It is evaluation panels who should report to appropriate management those supervisors whose reports contribute little to the evaluation process.

- In particular,*
- f. (U) ☒ A requirement to evaluate all employees on a set of standard or general factors should perhaps be considered, i.e. all employees could be evaluated on attitude, punctuality, judgement, effectiveness in interpersonal relationships, self-expression orally or in writing, mobility, security consciousness, willingness to accept responsibility, creativity, and initiative, versatility, evidence of self-improvement, etc. (See Attachment B.)
- g. (U) Finally, a specific section of the form should be provided to rate every supervisor, manager, and executive on his equal employment opportunity performance with an explanation of why that evaluation (either good, bad or indifferent) was arrived at.



James A. Taylor

Attachments:

- A. IG Comments  
B. Sample ECS Individual Evaluation Rating